REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on October 4, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks. In the present application, claims 1 and 10-19 have been amended and new claim 21 has been added. The claims have been amended to clarify that the screen data defined in at least one of the plurality of properties files for the host session comprises a plurality of field definitions for data appearing on a host session screen, the definitions including at least one of a field name and a flag indicating whether a field is read only or read/write. New claim 21 incorporates the allowable features identified in claim 7. Support for the claim amendments may be found on page 9, lines 17-23 in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. In the Office Action, claims 10-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claims 1-6, 8-15, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al. (US 5,958,018, hereinafter "King" in view of Cascio et al. (US 2002/0091818, hereinafter "Cascio"). Claims 7 and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 20 is allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 10-18 are rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 10-18 have been amended to recite a "computer-readable storage medium" to define a tangible embodiment and to distinguish other embodiments such as "communication media." Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 10-18 are directed to statutory subject matter and the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §101 should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-6, 8-15, and 17-19 are rejected as being unpatenable over King in view of Cascio. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 specifies a method of managing a host session on a remote computer in a computer system. The method includes sending a request to establish the host session from a client computer, the request including a presentation space, wherein the client computer has access to a plurality of properties files defining a plurality of screens for the host session; receiving in the presentation space a response to the request from the remote computer, the response including host screen data; identifying the response by comparing the host screen data in the presentation space to screen data defined in at least one of the plurality of properties files for the host session, wherein the screen data defined in at least one of the plurality of properties files for the host session comprises a plurality of field definitions for data appearing on a host session screen, the definitions including at least one of a field name and a flag indicating whether a field is read only or read/write; and performing an action based on the identified response.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of King and Cascio fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each and every feature specified in amended claim 1. For example, the aforementioned combination fails to disclose screen data defined in at least one of the plurality of properties files for the host session which comprises a plurality of field definitions for data appearing on a host session screen, the definitions including at least one of a field name and a flag indicating whether a field is read only or read/write.

King discusses providing a session between a computer and a host-based application without mediation of a session by an intermediate server, which persists notwithstanding subsequent access of different resource locations, and which uses an architecture that is accessible to other applications resident at the computer. A computer loads terminal emulation information from a host access resource location of a network and processes the loaded terminal emulation information to conduct a session with a host computer application. Processing of the terminal emulation information preferably causes the instantiation of an object structure at the computer that is accessible to other applications resident at the computer. The terminal emulation information may comprise a Java applet. An object structure for conducting persistent sessions includes a Presentation Space Object which maintains a virtual host display screen for a session. External methods for the Presentation Space Object may include getting and setting presentation space content, getting and setting field content, getting field attributes, navigating fields, accepting keyboard, function key and other user inputs, and the like. See Col. 2, line 42 through Col. 4, line 22 and Col. 9, lines 49-60.

As conceded in the Office Action, King fails to explicitly state that the client computer has access to a plurality of properties fields defining a plurality of screens for the host session, identifying the response by comparing the host screen data in the presentation space to screen data defined in at least one of the plurality of properties files for the host session, and performing an action based on the identified response. King also fails to disclose a plurality of field definitions for data appearing on a host session screen, the definitions including at least one of a field name and a flag indicating whether a field is read only or read/write, as specified in amended claim 1. In contrast, King is concerned with getting and setting field content, getting attributes, and navigating fields, not defining the fields themselves. Thus, King fails to disclose

defining a field name and a flag for a field on a host session screen in a screen properties file, as specified in amended claim 1.

Cascio, relied upon in the Office Action for allegedly curing the deficiencies of King, also fails to teach, disclose, or suggest screen data defined in at least one of the plurality of properties files for the host session which comprises a plurality of field definitions for data appearing on a host session screen, the definitions including at least one of a field name and a flag indicating whether a field is read only or read/write. In contrast, Cascio discusses extracting data from a data stream and writing the extracted data to one or more output documents. Incoming data is compared to selected ones of stored data extraction rules until a matching rule is detected. Upon detecting a matching rule, the data is extracted and stored in an extensible document. The rules may specify textual patterns, data element and attribute patterns or a combination of the patterns. See paragraphs 0025 and 0027.

Cascio however, fails to disclose screen data which comprises field definitions including a field name, or a flag indicating whether the field is read only or read/write. Instead, Cascio is directed to data extraction rules which specify patterns (i.e., textual, data element, and attribute patterns). It is respectfully submitted that the aforementioned patterns are not field definitions for fields utilized on a host session screen. In contrast, Cascio utilizes patterns for extracting and storing data in extensible documents (such as XML documents – see paragraph 0077).

Based on the foregoing, the combination of King and Cascio fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended claim 1. Therefore, amended claim 1 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 2-6 and 8-9 depend from amended claim 1, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn. Amended independent claims 10 and 19 specify

similar features as amended claim 1 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn. Claims 11-15 and 17 depend from amended claims 10, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

New Claim

New independent claim 21 incorporates the allowable features of dependent claim 7 which were identified in the Office Action. Therefore, this claim is allowable over the cited art of record for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5100

/Alton Hornsby, III/

Date: April 4, 2008

Alton Hornsby, III
Reg. No. 47,299

AH:mdc